UNITED
NATIONS

S

Security Council

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.3228
4 June 1993

ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE THREE THOUSAND
TWO HUNDRED AND TWENTY-EIGHTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 4 June 1993, at 11 a.m.

President:	Mr. YAÑEZ BARNUEVO	(Spain)
Members:	Brazil	Mr. SARDENBERG
	Cape Verde	Mr. JESUS
	China	Mr. LI Zhaoxing
	Djibouti	Mr. OLHAYE
	France	Mr. MERIMEE
	Hungary	Mr. ERDÖS
	Japan	Mr. HATANO
	Morocco	Mr. BENJELLOUN-TOUIMI
	New Zealand	Mr. O'BRIEN
	Pakistan	Mr. MARKER
	Russian Federation	Mr. VORONTSOV
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir David HANNAY
	United States of America	Mrs. ALBRIGHT
	Venezuela	Mr. ARRIA

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the Security Council.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Office of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

93-85951 4532V (E)

The meeting was called to order at 11.35 a.m.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

THE SITUATION IN THE REPUBLIC OF BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to inform the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Bosnia and Herzegovina and Turkey in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Sacirbey (Bosnia and Herzegovina) took a place at the Council table; Mr. Batu (Turkey) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on the agenda. The Security Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

Members of the Council have before them document S/25870, which contains the text of a draft resolution submitted by France, the Russian Federation, Spain, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America.

(The President)

I should like to draw the attention of the members of the Council to the following documents: S/25800, note verbale dated 19 May 1993 from the Permanent Representative of France to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council; S/25823, letter dated 21 May 1993 from the Permanent Representative of Italy to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General; S/25829, letter dated 24 May 1993 from the Permanent Representatives of France, the Russian Federation, Spain, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council; S/25782, letter dated 14 May 1993 from the Permanent Representative of Pakistan to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council; S/25860, letter dated 25 May 1993 from the Permanent Representative of Pakistan to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General; S/25872, S/25877 and S/25878, letters dated 30 May, 2 June and 2 June 1993, respectively, from the Permanent Representative of Bosnia and Herzegovina to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council.

The first speaker on my list is the representative of Bosnia and Herzegovina, on whom I now call.

Mr. SACIRBEY (Bosnia and Herzegovina): Mr. President, let me first congratulate you on your assuming the leadership of the Security Council for this month of June. Early on, you are facing what is obviously a very difficult task. Both you and I can only hope that it will become easier.

Also at this time, let me congratulate my Slavic colleague, the Permanent Representative of the Russian Federation, Mr. Yuliy Vorontsov, for his able leadership during the month of May.

(Mr. Sacirbey, Bosnia and Herzegovina)

With the full realization that this is not 1984, there is a new Orwellian vocabulary being introduced with respect to Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1993. We all now know the names - Sarajevo, Srebrenica, Tuzla, Bihac, Zepa and Gorazde - because by the grace of the Security Council these towns have been defined as "safe areas". There is another, much larger set of names, such as Maglaj, Vares, Travnik, Banja Luka, Velika Kladusa, Zenica, Stolac, Kakanj; these and countless other towns and villages, by exclusion, must be the new "non-safe areas" of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

It is especially tragic that this draft resolution will most likely have a greater impact in giving true meaning to the term "non-safe area" than to the designation "safe area": by decreeing its protection to only the towns specifically designated as "safe areas"; by effectively restricting the Government's right, through a continuing arms embargo, to defend areas not designated as "safe areas" and by allowing this to go on for an indefinite period, with no programme for a real, lasting peace, the Security Council has, at least implicitly, declared an open season on the unfortunate majority of our towns and citizens, who do not happen to fall into "safe areas".

Imagine: if the legal authorities of any nation decreed that only citizens living in a few disjointed communities would receive the benefit of legal protection, that all others outside the designated safe communities would be prohibited the means of self-defence and that this arrangement would be indefinite, what would be the reaction of the citizens to this incomprehensible scenario? More to the point, what do you think would be the message to, and the reaction of the well-armed criminal element?

(Mr. Sacirbey, Bosnia and Herzegovina)

But how accurate is the term "safe area", even with respect to the six towns so designated? First, the Secretary-General's report of last week, requested by this Council, says that the mandate to make these areas safe is not realistically possible. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization exclaims that it does not even understand the proposed mandate.

Secondly, will the designation "safe area" be defined to allow for any semblance of a normal life? If we look at the example of Srebrenica as a "safe area", life is neither safe nor normal for its citizens, who are crammed into a mostly destroyed town with no water, electricity, medicines, doctors or even adequate food. It is an open concentration camp, where disease, hunger and despair have replaced shells and bullets as the tools of genocide. Most unfortunately, it is the United Nations that has unwittingly become the custodian of this modern-age leper colony.

Thirdly, what comfort can the citizens of Bosnia have in the resolve of United-Nations-mandated forces to defend "safe areas"? Sarajevo suffered the heaviest shelling within the last year only after being designated a "safe area". Zepa has become virtually a ghost town after being shelled by Serbian forces in recognition of its designation. In the meantime, Gorazde has been a safe area for almost two months or more, and it has not received a single relief convoy. And now, when it is being subjected to genocidal assault, not a single United Nations observer has braved Serbian obstructions to enter and fulfil this Council's mandate. Ultimately, we fear that United Nations forces will be mostly defending ghost towns or succumbing to the evil will of Serbian forces.

(Mr. Sacirbey, Bosnia and Herzegovina)

Without clear time limits and long-term solutions, the United Nations forces will make the bureaucratically wise decision that the "safe areas" are too costly and risky to maintain, and will remove the by then listless and psychologically tortured population to new "safe areas" in a final act of United Nations-executed "ethnic cleansing".

There is another new term in this special dictionary for Bosnia and Herzegovina: Joint Action Programme. One word in that phrase is especially misleading - "Action". Diplomacy provides wide latitude in the manipulation of words, but we all know that the objective that has motivated this Programme is avoidance.

(Mr. Sacirbey, Bosnia and Herzegovina)

After over a year of genocidal aggression, broken Serbian promises, arrogant rejection of peace plans and empty commitments to challenge the aggressor, those who wish to bestow upon themselves the title of world Powers now again seek diplomatic cover to avoid confronting petty criminals turned murderers.

I just wonder why the one world super-Power has allowed itself to be compromised into this "joint avoidance programme" by would-be super-Powers that betray their own peace plan and the principles of multiculturalism, pluralism and democracy.

Integrity and virtue once lost are difficult to recapture.

Principles, once compromised, no longer can be the basis for a new legal, moral or even strategic world order.

Status and the privileges of leadership carry a corresponding responsibility. Bosnia and Herzegovina has amply witnessed the display of status; there has been a lack of will of real leadership; and we certainly have not been the beneficiaries of responsibilities honoured.

The new dictionary for Bosnia and Herzegovina is also puzzling for the terms it is deleting - terms such as the Vance-Owen Peace Plan, commitment to long-term peace, sovereignty and reversing aggression. Maybe the current situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina is most accurately reflected by the absence of these terms.

I do not wish to present the position of the Government of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina only as a bitter critique of the programmes and draft resolutions proposed by certain members of this Council. We, the Government of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, attempted to participate in a constructive process to promote long-term peace in our country.

(Mr. Sacirbey, Bosnia and Herzegovina)

We initially were not even consulted regarding the programme or the draft resolution, but none the less we made the following key but brief suggestions:

First, apply the safe areas concept more broadly to address the threats against other population centres in Bosnia and Herzegovina or at least to give the defence forces of Bosnia and Herzegovina the unhindered opportunity to be responsive to such threats;

Secondly, establish a time frame to move from the temporary, symptomatic relief offered by the "safe areas" programme towards the implementation of the Vance-Owen plan and real peace;

Thirdly, if the Serbians are unwilling to accept the Vance-Owen Plan and any semblance of real peace by a date certain, then allow for all necessary measures to be applied to confront aggression and restore peace, or, at least, consistent with Article 51, fully recognise our Government's right to self-defence against an aggressor committing genocide, whose capability to commit this genocide is sustained by the denial to the victim of the necessary outside help or weapons of self-defence;

Fourthly, after a necessary review with the Secretariat, design a mandate that considers all resources necessary to defend the safe areas and produce a realistic plan for implementing and enforcing such a mandate truly to justify the designation "safe areas";

and, fifthly, shorten the review period for the success of the implementation of the resolution and overall progress towards peace from two months to 30 days; Bosnia does not have the luxury of time while the Serbian assaults continue.

Those constructive proposals apparently were rejected. This can only lead us to the conclusion that what motivates at least some of the sponsors is

(Mr. Sacirbey, Bosnia and Herzegovina)

a diplomatic cover to mitigate the need and responsibility for more resolute and comprehensive measures. The manner in which the exercise of drafting this draft resolution was handled and the lack of key elements promoting true peace and real safe areas make us very suspicious that the motivations behind the draft resolution most directly reflect a continuing lack of will to confront the aggressor and an absence of commitment to the Republic and people of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I thank the representative of Bosnia and Herzegovina for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Turkey. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. BATU (Turkey): Allow me to congratulate you, Sir, on assuming the presidency of the Council for the month of June. We are confident that you will successfully preside over the deliberations on the critical issues before the Council. I also pay tribute to Ambassador Vorontsov of the Russian Federation for his able guidance of the Council last month.

The situation on the ground in Bosnia and Herzegovina has not changed. The daily shelling of Muslim-populated cities, which has resulted in thousands of casualties, the brutal uprooting of the Bosnian Muslim population from their ancestral homes, the destruction of their property as well as their historical shrines - in short, genocide under the name of "ethnic cleansing" - continue.

The political situation also remains unchanged. The Muslim Government and the Bosnian Croats have signed the Vance-Owen Peace Plan. The Serbs made a mockery of the international community by signing it and subsequently reneging on their commitment by rejecting it.

(Mr. Batu, Turkey)

In the meantime, the international community continues to pursue its course of indecision and fails to take coercive action that would once and for all stop the aggression.

The "joint action programme" - in itself a document that reflects the failure to take the determined stand anticipated from the Council - appears to accept the status quo imposed by the use of force. Our criticism of the programme is made clear in the Declaration adopted by the members of the Organization of the Islamic Conference at the United Nations on 24 May.

Likewise, the draft resolution before us falls short of our expectations.

First, we would have hoped that the proposal of the Non-Aligned Caucus of the Council on giving the Serbian aggressors a deadline to initiate the implementation of the Vance-Owen Plan would by now be included in a Security Council resolution.

Secondly, despite the affirmation that the safe areas are a temporary measure and that the primary objective remains to reverse the consequences of the use of force, there is no guarantee of effective enforcement measures to this end. We also fear that the meaning of "temporary" may be extended far beyond our expectations.

Thirdly, and most significantly, the draft resolution, in addressing the rights provided for in the Charter of the United Nations to the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina as a Member State, fails to acknowledge its inherent right to self-defence, a right which has been denied for too long. We fear that with the shortcomings of this draft resolution the Council will only be augmenting its failure to maintain the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

(Mr. Batu, Turkey)

Bearing in mind our obligation to act in conformity with the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations, our sole aim, from the beginning of the crisis, has been to help restore peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina and to secure its independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and unity by rejecting the acquisition of territory through violence and force, and, in this case, genocide.

(Mr. Batu, Turkey)

It is with these intentions that, having observed the inability of the international community to act effectively against Serbian defiance, we continue strongly to advocate the use of force to stop Serbian aggression. We stress that Bosnia and Herzegovina, under its inherent right of individual or collective self-defence, in accordance with Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, should be exempted without delay from the arms embargo.

Within the context of concerted international humanitarian action, we continue within our means to offer material support to help alleviate the suffering of the Bosnian people. We also reiterate our preparedness to contribute troops to UNPROFOR, whose role is expanding.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I thank the representative of Turkey for the kind words he addressed to me.

It is my understanding that the Security Council is ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution before it. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that that is the case.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

Before putting the draft resolution to the vote, I shall call on those members of the Council who wish to make statements before the voting.

Mr. MERIMEE (France) (interpretation from French): The Security Council is meeting today to consider its response to the deterioration of the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina following a hopeful moment: the signature by the three parties concerned of the peace plan proposed by Mr. Vance and Lord Owen.

(Mr. Mérimée, France)

Military attacks, the acquisition of territory by force and the practice of "ethnic cleansing" have continued in Bosnia and Herzegovina following the stubborn refusal by the Bosnian Serb party to accept the Peace Plan, despite its having signed it on 2 May at Athens. Those practices aim at retaining the maximum territory in contradiction of the principles contained in the Plan; they result in ever-increasing suffering by the civilian population in the areas designated for Muslim communities. For those two reasons they are completely unacceptable.

As members know, France was the first country to have committed troops to Bosnia and Herzegovina, first in Sarajevo then in the Bihac area; along with others - the United Kingdom, Spain, Canada, Egypt and Ukraine - we remain there to ease the situation of Muslim civilians.

On the basis of its experience and in order to confront the situation I have just described, my Government, on 19 May, issued a memorandum on the concept of safe areas. Following the adoption, at Washington on 22 May, of a joint programme of action, France and its partners proposed that the Council adopt a draft resolution ensuring full respect for the safe areas named in resolution 824 (1993) and to that end to extend the mandate of the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR).

The draft resolution addresses an immediate, vital humanitarian objective: ensuring the survival of civilian populations in the safe areas. It also addresses a paramount political objective: maintaining the territorial basis needed for the development and implementation of the Peace Plan for Bosnia and Herzegovina.

(Mr. Mérimée, France)

In that connection, I want to stress that the designation and protection of safe areas is not an end in itself, but only a temporary measure: a step towards a just and lasting political solution. This must be understood as a positive contribution to the process begun by the Vance-Owen Plan, which remains the basis for any settlement.

I wish also to note the realistic and operational nature of the draft resolution. Through changes in and the strengthening of UNPROFOR, its provisions are aimed at ensuring the protection of the safe areas by deterring attacks against them, by monitoring the cease-fire, by promoting the withdrawal of military units other than those of the Government of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and by occupying several key points on the ground. Those provisions would be implemented in parallel with the mandate established in resolutions 770 (1992) and 776 (1992) and would not affect UNPROFOR's current task of protecting the delivery of humanitarian aid.

To carry out the new mandate, the draft resolution explicitly provides for the possibility of using force to respond to bombardments against the safe areas, to armed incursions into them or to any deliberate obstacles to the freedom of movement of UNPROFOR or of protected humanitarian convoys. It also provides for the use of air power within and around the safe areas in order to support UNPROFOR in the fulfilment of its mandate, if necessary.

I want to conclude by reiterating the fact that the draft resolution is only a first step towards the implementation of the provisions of the Vance-Owen Plan. It provides for the speedy implementation of provisions of that Plan in the areas where they have been agreed to by the parties directly concerned.

(Mr. Mérimée, France)

By adopting this draft resolution the Council will demonstrate that the international community is not standing idly by. It has not resigned itself to a solution of despair that would end with UNPROFOR's withdrawal from the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina and which would amount to letting the parties fight it out. Thus, the Council is shouldering its responsibilities and maintaining a steady course: the untiring search for a political solution.

Mr. ARRIA (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation is highly pleased, Mr. President, to see you, at the head of your very talented delegation, guiding the work of the Council. We are convinced that you will carry out your responsibilities as President with great skill.

We wish also to congratulate Mr. Yuliy Vorontsov, Permanent Representative of the Russian Federation, on the excellent, skilful way in which he carried out the tasks of President last month.

With the indulgence of the Council, I shall speak at greater than usual length, given the vital importance of the issue before the Council today.

The proclamation of a new world order inspired great hope in those of us who interpreted this as a world in which no State would be able to abuse another with impunity. Now, with the terrible experience of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, we see that one country can indeed abuse another so long as it is careful not to threaten or jeopardize the strategic interests of the international community. Rather than being broadened and strengthened, the principle of collective security seems to be growing narrower and weaker in this new world order.

(Mr. Arria, Venezuela)

Venezuela, along with Cape Verde, Djibouti, Morocco and Pakistan - the so-called non-aligned group within the Security Council - played a decisive role in the adoption of resolutions 819 (1993) and 824 (1993), which created safe areas, first in Srebrenica, then in Sarajevo, Gorazde, Zepa, Tuzla and Bihac. We were and continue to be totally in favour of establishing truly safe areas, with the necessary protection and guarantees to which I shall refer in due course as I state my delegation's view of what safe areas should be.

In yesterday's informal consultations, we asked the proponents of the draft resolution before the Council today to wait for a report by the Secretary-General - the executor of the Council's decisions - on the means he has and, above all, the means he would need to implement the resolution on safe areas.

(Mr. Arria, Venezuela)

This request was not met, in spite of the fact that the Council still hopes to receive this report of the Secretary-General before taking action. On this occasion, in spite of the extraordinary importance of the situation, the sponsors of the draft resolution decided to ignore the request on which our vote now depends.

Clearly, this draft resolution could not be implemented without the resolve to do so and until the Secretary-General had the necessary means and resources and had decided on the best options that could be put to the Council for approval.

Unfortunately, it was decided not to await the opinion of the Secretary-General. Undoubtedly underlying that decision was the report that the Secretary-General submitted on the request of the non-aligned members of the Security Council on 28 May, which contains an objective and highly critical evaluation of the situation to which the so-called safe areas are subjected. The report pointed out that without a cease-fire in the safe areas the concept of safe areas would be virtually impossible to implement, and it would be necessary for the United Nations to establish a sort of protectorate in each of those areas.

The report posed the questions: What would be the United Nations responsibility if the aggressors were to accept the establishment of safe areas but later refused to withdraw from their surroundings? Would the United Nations then be obliged to use force in order to make them withdraw? Would the Security Council be prepared to authorize military action in order to meet this objective?

These are all particularly valid questions, as we can see from the situation in Gorazde, Zepa, Sarajevo, Bihac and Srebrenica - all of which

(Mr. Arria, Venezuela)

are safe areas. These are questions which no one on the Council has satisfactorily answered, and they are questions that are too important for a body such as the Security Council not to be duly clarified. They are important for the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR), for those who remain in the safe areas in deplorable conditions, and for the Serbian aggressors themselves, who would surely tailor their actions to the answers given to these questions.

In exercising its responsibilities as a non-permanent member of the Security Council, Venezuela has endeavoured to make its contribution to strengthening the purposes and principles of the Charter in the context of the major changes that are taking place in the contemporary political and security fields. One of the most complex subjects, and undoubtedly one which best reflects the challenges to these purposes and principles today, has been the conflict in the former Yugoslavia.

Therein are reflected subjects such as the disintegration of a State; the threat to the stability and security of a region, with international implications; the resurgence and growing expansion of various civil conflicts fraught with the danger of international conflict; the systematic violation of the most fundamental principles of humanitarian law; "ethnic cleansing" as an instrument of territorial conquest; the crime of genocide; and a monumental crisis of displaced persons and refugees - to mencion but its most obvious aspects.

The Council is very well aware of the challenges that all of this poses, for it is dealing with them on a daily basis. For Venezuela - as I am sure is the case for each and every one of the Member States - the desire and will to put an end to all this human and social tragedy has guided all of our

(Mr. Arria, Venezuela)

actions. In the course of a year and a half we have been taking decision after decision, convinced that each one was not only necessary but also useful in the quest to achieve these purposes. Thirty-six resolutions and 30 presidential statements have been adopted.

Hence, we wish first of all to commend the London Conference. We have systematically supported its Co-Chairmen in their efforts at mediation and negotiation. We have backed their proposals and intentions by various measures and approved their recommendations as contained in the Peace Plan for the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

For reasons which it is not for my country to judge, the whole of the Council's proposals have not been followed through to their ultimate goals. The Peace Plan, in which so much effort has been invested and in which so much confidence and hope have been placed - especially by the victims of the conflict - is today still just a process, a frame of reference, and as such lacks the endorsement that would give it authority and make it what it was meant to be: a means of restoring justice in order to guarantee the rights of all and serve as a reliable basis for the restoration of peace.

The result of this abdication is that the Council today lacks a credible instrument to achieve its objectives. It has been argued that that is not the case, that the Peace Plan remains valid and that it is only a question of seeking the best way of seeing to it that it eventually be implemented, maintaining that agreement among the parties is an essential prerequisite, and that in order to achieve this it is appropriate to embark on an exercise of growing pressures, sanctions and isolation. It has been pointed out that the situation is such that it is only possible to try to save what can be saved, while awaiting better times. On 22 May, the Vance-Owen Plan was in effect

(Mr. Arria, Venezuela)

replaced by the Washington plan of action. Curiously, the only party that did not support the Vance-Owen Plan - the Serbian party - is the only one that today is enthusiastically supporting the plan of action.

With all due respect for our colleagues on the Council, Venezuela does not subscribe to such assessments and recommendations because it believes that they run counter to reality. We note with profound concern that this conflict is seen by the major countries as being unrelated to their strategic interests, which is certainly in contradiction with the approach that just a short time ago guided them. This was an approach based on the unacceptability of the solution of conflicts by force, the unacceptability of putting at risk the territorial integrity of a Member State, the non-recognition of political or territorial gains achieved by aggression and the terror of "ethnic cleansing", the urgent need to find the just and equitable solutions the conflict requires and, above all, the need to put an end to the crisis and to do justice, given the unprecedented series of abuses and crimes that have characterized it.

None the less, and in spite of all evidence of manipulation, delaying tactics, acts of aggression by some against others, it is felt now that all that are needed are containment and prevention measures: safe areas, border monitors, strengthening sanctions, the prohibition of overflights, a tribunal for crimes against humanitarian law.

The obvious questions are: How? When? On what bases? Can we believe that this attitude will convince the aggressors that it is best graciously to renounce what they have conquered by terror and by force? Are we really capable of believing that this will be the inevitable consequence of this type of decision? In our view, this is not the case. The only inevitable and

(Mr. Arria, Venezuela)

inescapable deduction that we can draw is that in this conflict there has not been the firm determination to face reality, which we are now hastening to recognize de facto, legitimizing the situation as a basis for a solution which sooner or later will inevitably be imposed.

At its recent session in May, the European Parliament, under the presidency of the Foreign Minister of Denmark, debated the plan of action. The Parliament adopted a resolution which clearly expresses its disagreement with the plan, a plan which "gives the impression of conceding the palm of victory to the aggressors", and reiterates the need to follow strictly the Vance-Owen Peace Plan.

(Mr. Arria, Venezuela)

It invites, in particular, the European Parliament and the European members of the Security Council not to endorse as a basis for a peace agreement the results of Serbian aggression, with its territorial conquests achieved by force and terror, and invites the Council to promote a plan including the necessary military presence to disarm the Serbian aggressors.

This resolution of the European Parliament should not go unnoticed. Its content and its political legitimacy, coming from so great and important a geographical area where genocide is arising once again, give it extraordinary significance.

I felt it necessary to state the foregoing because the Council is at a historic crossroads in the discharge of its responsibilities. Hence, the import of the decisions we take from now on goes beyond the conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

For Venezuela, the draft resolution before the Council today has serious difficulties that we have not been able to resolve in the course of our extensive consultations. It proposes an initiative that we find, on the one hand, incomplete in scope and, on the other, contrary to its own objectives. In this draft the Council concentrates on those areas still under siege and attack, in an attempt to save them. This is well and good. However, it also makes it clear that it does so in the face of political reluctance to shoulder the same degree of responsibility for the broader and more meaningful goal of the fair and equitable distribution of territory between the various communities of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The link between this initiative and the Peace Plan will be merely theoretical as long as there is no genuine will to carry out the Plan. In these circumstances, its implementation still depends on the party that has resorted to force, that

(Mr. Arria, Venezuela)

holds sway over the territory and that continues to defy with impunity the international community and the values it strives to represent.

The draft resolution also proposes the extension of protective measures for a certain number of urban centres having a predominantly Muslim population, where refugees and displaced persons are also concentrated. These centres today amount to enclaves under economic and military siege, surviving only by the whim of the aggressor. As already stated, Venezuela has no quarrel with the good intention of remedying this situation. However, we vigorously disagree with the proposed way in which this is to be achieved, and our conviction is based on the way in which such "safe areas" have, in practice, functioned. They appear to be - and in fact, are - nothing more than ethnic reservations under the wing of the United Nations. We fear that this Organization will be indefinitely committed to answering for and prolonging those aberrations.

In the view of my delegation, safe areas - as has been stated by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and the Secretariat of the United Nations, and as I concluded personally during my recent visit to the so-called safe area of Srebrenica - should be temporary, intermediate steps in the peace process. They should not be a substitute for peace or a solution to the problems faced by threatened peoples. They should provide a minimum of safety for the "normal" life of their inhabitants, and they should be open areas where respect for human rights can be verified and humanitarian assistance can be received unimpeded. They should not confine people as if they were in prison.

They should guarantee freedom of movement into and out of the area; international military presence; unrestricted presence of the UNHCR and other humanitarian agencies, including non-governmental groups; the right to

(Mr. Arria, Venezuela)

humanitarian assistance; respect for human rights and the rights of minorities; uninterrupted access to basic services, such as water, electricity and communications; and access to economic activities.

In addition to being provided security against military attack, which would only be possible by seizing or neutralizing the heavy armaments of the Serbs, and humanitarian assistance, these areas should be able to restore their civil government, local police, schools, productive activities and social services.

The conditions I have described are almost the exact opposite of those existing today in the so-called safe areas, and the draft resolution before us does not address their main points. We should call them what they are: ghettoes, refugee camps, open jails, areas under threat; but we should never be so brazen as to call them "safe areas".

Perhaps the best description of a "safe area" was given by the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR) spokesman, Commander Barry Frewer, upon the Serbian refusal to admit UNPROFOR into the "safe area" of Gorazde after it had been trying for a month to gain entry:

> "We are going to put up a sign on the outskirts of Gorazde that says: 'SAFE AREA - VERY DANGEROUS - KEEP OUT'.

In this context I should like to quote from the letter dated 1 June from the President of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Mr. Alija Izetbegovic, addressed to the President of our Council. It says,

> "Serb paramilitary units, directly supported by the Yugoslav Army from Serbia, continue their aggression throughout Bosnia and Herzegovina ...

(Mr. Arria, Venezuela)

"The aggressor is able to do this because you, the Security Council, have tied our hands while our people are being killed and our country is being destroyed.

"You say that you do not wish to take sides in this conflict. But, Excellencies, you implicitly and explicitly took sides in this conflict when the Council imposed an arms embargo on the former Yugoslavia and when the Council decided to enforce the same resolution in respect of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The arms embargo has substantially helped the well-armed aggressor and tragically weakened the victim. This is now obvious to everyone.

"The consequences are clear and tragic: two thirds of our country is occupied; over 200,000 civilians have been killed; more than 2 million civilians have been uprooted from their homes; hundreds of towns and villages have been destroyed. This is the price this country and its people have paid for one unfortunate decision and for your unyielding opposition to it being corrected, ...". (S/25873, Annex)

This is an issue that the Council should duly re-evaluate under the provisions of article 51 of the Charter.

The central argument that has been put forward in the Council for not dealing with this tragedy with greater determination is that there are not enough military or financial resources available for us to put several thousand troops on the ground. Again and again we hear that nothing more can be done and that this is the only way to prevent Bosnia and Herzegovina from losing all of its territory. To be frank, I must recall that when the Council adopted the resolution that left it up to the coalition to deal with the trampling, vandalization and appropriation of a Member country, Kuwait, the

(Mr. Arria, Venezuela)

international community deployed 500,000 military personnel, dividing the monumental cost among a group of countries. Vital interests were more closely linked to that crisis than to the vandalization of this other Member country, which gets no such generous response from the international community. Nevertheless, without my attempting to compare the two situations, this tragedy has far more worrisome dimensions, as manifested in unspeakable crimes against humanity. There are essential values that should indeed be of strategic importance for the international community.

The Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina has communicated officially to the Council its rejection of the particular modality of "safe areas" as contained in this draft resolution. This position has not even been considered by the Council, though it is traditionally attentive to the opinions of parties in conflict, especially when they are Member States.

My delegation took a very active part in working on the resolutions that provide for the creation of "safe areas" for Sarajevo, Srebrenica, Tuzla, Zepa, Gorazde and Bihac, and we could, thus, never be opposed to the concept. What we oppose is the shape this humanitarian modality has taken in practice.

Along with the other members of the Non-Aligned Caucus, we have tried to contribute solutions to the dilemmas and we have profited from frank exchanges of views on the subject. It has not been possible to resolve the substantive differences that separate us from other members of the Council with regard to what steps could have shown, according to some views, the unquestionable will no longer to tolerate the prevailing situation and to rechannel our initiatives in a common conception of the desirable solutions.

(Mr. Arria, Venezuela)

Perhaps our own assessment was influenced by the experience of having visited, upon the initiative of the Council, the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the safe area of Srebrenica, as part of the mission that was sent over a month ago to assess the situation and make recommendations to the Security Council. At that time, I described Srebrenica as an open prison, subject to slow genocide. We stated that Srebrenica was an emergency situation and that it must not become a model to be followed. Why? Because that safe area - a misnomer - is in reality becoming a refugee camp controlled and supervised by the refugees' aggressors.

If we were to draw a conclusion from this conflict, would it not be that we should all be armed, because if the United Nations were to impose on us an embargo, we would be at the mercy of our enemies? No one should, of course, fall for this erroneous solution. What we must do is respect and apply collective security, which ensures the right to self-defence, as guaranteed by the Charter.

While we have been attempting to negotiate the Peace Plan, Bosnia and Herzegovina has lost two thirds of its territory, and its people have been the victims of mounting crimes and violations on an unprecedented and unacceptable scale. Today, this State Member of our Organization is on the verge of disappearing under the weight of terror. Circumstances require that the Council take substantive action in order to stem this extermination. This is the time to really take action, not just to appear to be taking action.

For all of these reasons, the Venezuelan delegation will abstain in the vote on the draft resolution that is now before the Council.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I thank the representative of Venezuela for the kind words he addressed to me.

Mr. MARKER (Pakistan): The Government and the people of Pakistan have been following with deep anguish and grave concern the unfolding tragedy in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The defenceless civilian population in that country, and the Muslims in particular, have been and continue to be subjected to naked aggression, massive violations of basic human rights and fundamental freedoms, and genocide through the pernicious practice of "ethnic cleansing".

The crisis in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina poses a historic challenge for the international community. What we do in Bosnia and Herzegovina may well determine the course of the post-cold-war era.

Pakistan has consistently urged the international community, and particularly the Council, to act swiftly and firmly on the basis of the principles enshrined in the United Nations Charter. We have advocated decisive, expeditious and comprehensive action by the Security Council under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter to enforce its decisions and to authorize the use of all necessary measures, including the use of air strikes against key strategic targets to halt the Serbian aggression, reverse it through withdrawals from all territories occupied by the use of force and "ethnic cleansing", and fully to restore the territorial integrity, unity and sovereignty of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The Organization of the Islamic Conference has also strongly supported the early and effective end of the aggression against the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Since the crisis erupted, it has held two emergency meetings and a meeting of the extended Bureau. At the twenty-first Islamic Conference

(Mr. Marker, Pakistan)

of Foreign Ministers, held in Karachi in April this year, it adopted a resolution calling for prompt and resolute action to end aggression and restore the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Bosnia and Herzegovina. It also, inter alia, called for the neutralization of heavy weapons, the interdiction of arms supplies to the Serbs, and the creation of safe areas wherein the population could live under conditions of relative normalcy.

I wish to state quite categorically that my delegation fully appreciates and is in favour of the basic thrust of this draft resolution, and will scrupulously work for its implementation when adopted. In this connection, I reiterate the offer of the Government of Pakistan to provide troops for peace-keeping operations in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina. I should like to point out that Pakistan, together with other non-aligned members of the Council, was the proponent of the concept of safe areas, which led to the adoption of Security Council resolutions 819 (1993) and 824 (1993) as an immediate response to an emergency situation in order to save lives. However, the experience in Srebrenica, Zepa and Goradze reveals the fundamental shortcomings of this concept in the absence of the international community's commitment to endorse the Vance-Owen Peace Plan. We also felt that it was necessary to clearly indicate and define the concept of safe areas, and that to ensure proper implementation it was necessary to incorporate this concept, taking into consideration the views of the Secretary-General, into the draft resolution before its adoption.

My delegation appreciates the spirit of accommodation demonstrated by the sponsors in incorporating so many of the amendments proposed by the caucus. In our view, however, the present draft resolution still does not address

(Mr. Marker, Pakistan)

certain core issues in the conflict in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina. We fear that, unless the measures contained in the draft resolution are supplemented by further appropriate enforcement actions by the Council in a given time frame and as part of an overall plan, the situation on the ground may be frozen to the advantage of the Serbs. The safe areas may become refugee camps in perpetuity, encircled by Serbs who would continue to exercise complete control on movement of people and goods. Under the present circumstances, the preservation of the status quo is to the benefit of the aggressor. My delegation would like to reiterate that under no circumstances should the international community accept or recognize, even by implication, the consequences of aggression and "ethnic cleansing".

My delegation believes that the modality of safe areas as contained in the draft resolution to be adopted by the Council is not in full conformity to our basic political and humanitarian concerns. Such strategy could be acceptable only if and when the international community commits itself to the full implementation of the Vance-Owen Peace Plan and, in particular, to its provisions on territorial arrangements for Bosnian Muslim communities. All Bosnian Muslim regions, as specified in the Peace Plan, as well as Sarajevo should be declared protected areas by the United Nations, and those already identified as safe areas should be given maximum protection. For these reasons, my delegation is constrained to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

The need to end the crisis in Bosnia and Herzegovina was never so great. My delegation strongly urges the Security Council to urgently take further appropriate steps, including the lifting of the arms embargo against Bosnia and Herzegovina, in conformity with its inherent right to self-defence under

(Mr. Marker, Pakistan)

Article 51 of the Charter, the neutralization of heavy weapons, interdiction of arms supplies to the aggressors and the strengthening of the United Nations peace-keeping forces in Bosnia and Herzegovina for enforcement action.

Mr. O'BRIEN (New Zealand): The decision that the Security Council is being asked to take today is significant. There are several features of the proposed decision that make it abundantly clear that this draft resolution is not, and cannot be, the complete answer to the dreadful outrage and violence that continues inside Bosnia. It is a distressing fact that the safe areas - as already designated by earlier Security Council decisions, which New Zealand supported, to meet immediate humanitarian needs - have not been respected. The lives of people within those areas remain at risk from Serb attack. The humanitarian effort is faltering because of wholly unjustified interdiction by Serbs.

(Mr. O'Brien, New Zealand)

The draft resolution is, as it stands, no more than a first step along the road back to justice, sanity and legality throughout Bosnia. The draft resolution makes that point explicitly, and it is very important that it does so. Such a decision must have a political context, and without such a framework it would be meaningless gesture for this Council to contemplate adoption of such a decision.

New Zealand has very carefully considered the position it should take in respect of this proposed resolution, which is, as I have said, but a first step. One feature above all others does warrant emphasis here, in our view; both the letter and the spirit of the text clearly provide that, if the Council adopts this decision, the Serbs must cease, immediately and conclusively, their present aggression and outrages in respect of the areas designated in the draft resolution. Unless they do so, a response in the form of air strikes can ensue.

Now, it is vitally important, in our view, that this message is clearly understood: if the Serbs refuse to abandon their aggression, the draft resolution does not require any further study by the Council, or an additional report from the Secretary-General, or, strictly, even a further meeting of the Security Council itself. It does not even require the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR) to be strengthened beforehand; action can be taken forthwith under the terms of paragraph 10 of the draft text. Deadlines are not required. So, if UNPROFOR is prevented on the ground from carrying out its tasks in terms of this draft resolution, including denial of access to any area; if humanitarian assistance continues to be interdicted and aggressions endure, actions in terms of this draft resolution - as a first step - will and must be taken.

(Mr. O'Brien, New Zealand)

Under your able guidance, Mr. President, New Zealand has participated, over the past few days, in informal consultations, as well as in bilateral exchanges, with the purpose, amongst other things, of establishing clearly the letter and spirit of the proposed resolution in this vitally important regard. It is of immense importance to us, and of vitally significant reassurance, that we have not encountered any doubts about the intent of immediacy in the proposed decision in regard to the designated areas, as I have explained; the use of air power is imminent unless the Serbs desist, right now and straight away.

On this understanding, New Zealand will therefore vote for the draft resolution. We must send a clear message, obviously, to the Serbs, now, to cease, conclusively, their activities in and around these denominated safe areas, or face the swift consequences. Any message less than this - as a first step - would be, in our view, gravely damaging to the Council's reputation and, indeed, to the United Nations as a whole. To adopt this draft resolution today, for the Serbian attacks to continue and for us to do nothing would call into serious question the Council's integrity, and everybody needs to be concerned about that.

New Zealand does recognize the special responsibilities of those Member States that will undertake the tasks required under paragraph 10. We acknowledge the heavy burden that they carry on their shoulders, particularly the key countries that have proposed today's draft resolution for our decision. Once adopted, this decision means that all eyes will be upon them. Expectations will be very high, and New Zealand acknowledges too, and applauds, the substantial efforts of the UNPROFOR commanders on the ground in Bosnia. They too carry a heavy responsibility, but in the event that the

(Mr. O'Brien, New Zealand)

Serbs do not cease their aggressions, all who bear these important responsibilities must ensure, subject to operational considerations on the ground, that action provided for in the present decision is swiftly taken, by the use of air power. In a real and direct sense, the draft resolution constitutes the political directive from the Council to the UNPROFOR commanders for the present stage.

We know - and we have listened attentively to the statements preceding this one - that some of our partners on the Council retain doubts about the integrity and effectiveness of the decision we are being asked to take today. New Zealand believes that, to the extent humanly possible, and because of the particular and significant implications in the draft resolution before us that I have touched upon, the Council should seek to act by consensus in this vitally important matter.

On the understandings I have just outlined, New Zealand will vote for the draft resolution.

Mr. JESUS (Cape Verde): The people and the Government of my country have been following the conflict in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina very closely and have witnessed with great indignation and a sense of disbelief the atrocities and the savagery waged against the Bosnian people. Indeed, we are appalled to see horrendous crimes being committed repeatedly and using the most savage methods. Like the overwhelming majority of the international community, we disapprove, and indeed we condemn the warring parties, mainly the Serbs, for the wanton policies and methods they are using in this conflict. "Ethnic cleansing" is a despicable way to conquer territory. The deliberate and the systematic shelling of cities, targeting

(Mr. Jesus, Cape Verde)

the civilian population, is a criminal method of conducting warfare, long condemned by international humanitarian law.

The humanitarian considerations that gave birth to, and for centuries have guided the development of international humanitarian law have been totally and systematically pushed aside in this conflict, but we are even more appalled at the inability of the international community to take action to put an end to this tragedy. Horrendous crimes have been repeatedly committed, territory has been conquered piece by piece by any and all inhumane methods, killing the civilian population has been a day-to-day goal and nothing, absolutely nothing, has spurred us, especially those of us that have the means and bear a special responsibility in the field of maintaining peace and security, into action to deter and put right the wrongdoings in this situation.

My country belongs to the group of countries that has advocated the taking of appropriate action by this Council to meet the challenges posed by, and provide an effective response to, this conflict, for we believe that, in a world fraught with scores of potential conflicts, the Council should send a message, through its actions and not just in words, that it is in charge, as the Charter meant it to be, and that it will not tolerate nor will it leave unpunished aggression or the use of force as a means of solving conflicts. To our regret, this message is still to be passed in the case of Bosnia.

(Mr. Jesus, Cape Verde)

Let us hope that the draft resolution before us today will set the tone of a new approach by the Council in the handling of the Bosnia conflict, which finally will have it asserting its primary responsibility under the Charter in an effective way.

Indeed, this draft resolution for the first time, and as a first step, commits the United Nations Protection Force to take defensive military action to protect the safe areas and their civilian population from attacks and bombardments. If the resolution does not remain a dead letter because of unwillingness to implement it - and we sincerely hope not - then we believe that this Council has finally started effectively to manage this conflict with a view to setting a course of action that will lead to a just and lasting solution. We look forward to receiving the Secretary-General's report on the modalities of the implementation of the resolution as soon as possible.

We take note of the fact that the draft resolution commits the United Nations Force to protect the safe areas as a first step, and that this Council is prepared to consider promptly new and tougher measures. We take it that the fact that we are today providing through the draft resolution for the protection of the safe areas does not in any way mean that the "non-safe areas" are up for grabs, so to speak.

We also note that the draft resolution affirms that the safe areas are a temporary measure, and that the primary objective remains to reverse the consequences of the use of force and to allow all persons displaced from their homes to return to them in peace, beginning, inter alia, with the prompt implementation of the provisions of the Vance-Owen Plan in areas where those have been agreed by the parties directly concerned. We therefore expect the Council to take further effective action to achieve this stated objective.

(Mr. Jesus, Cape Verde)

We are thankful to the sponsors for their efforts to accommodate the legitimate concerns of other delegations, including my own. Although the draft resolution does not address all the concerns we expressed in the course of its negotiation, we believe it has absorbed enough improvements to warrant our positive vote.

Mr. OLHAYE (Djibouti): Allow me to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency for this month. I am confident you will carry us through with skill and professionalism. May I also pay tribute to Ambassador Vorontsov of the Russian Federation for the efficient and creditable manner in which he guided the Council's work last month.

My delegation senses that many of us, as evidenced by some of the Council's recent actions, have appreciated the rising groundswell of world opinion against the continued atrocities in Bosnia, and the demand that they be stopped. My country obviously can make no claim to being a great military or economic Power capable of tipping the balance in world confrontations. But we can full well understand the plight of so many of the world's "little people", like the Bosnians, whose living and dying, whose life and death, have refused to fuse into a sort of distant irrelevancy. We may have in the end to thank the vicious Serbians for awakening the world's "silent majority", for shaming us into an increasingly unified cry: "Enough"! We are prepared to be counted among those ready to do whatever they can to stop what has been so correctly labelled a moral outrage, an evil.

We are incensed that the relentless litany of atrocities in Bosnia seems always to remain the same, only worse. The ceaseless bombardment of civilian populations, the detention camps, the murders of innocent women and children, the widespread rape, the refusal to let badly needed humanitarian aid reach

(Mr. Olhaye, Djibouti)

the suffering victims of this war, are all evidence of Serbian efforts to impose a final solution. Perhaps worst of all, there is a conviction that the Serbians have never really negotiated in good faith, that the countless repudiations of their sworn word indicates a criminality and cynicism rivalling the worst in European history. Virtually every act of good faith, every peace meeting, every attempt to reach an equitable cease-fire has been used by the Serbs simply to strengthen their military advantage. We can no longer believe them and their leaders.

If there is somewhere in the murky world of diplomacy a hidden agenda to accept in the end Serbian aggression and its fruits, so that all we say and do now is essentially a charade, so that the loss of human lives, the destroyed homes, the suffering and the death are in vain, then we must be prepared to add another chapter to the United Nations Charter and label it "International cynicism and deceit".

But if we do plan to hold fast to the spirit and provisions of Vance-Owen, the nine constitutional principles, the provincial map, the interim arrangements and the peace arrangement, then to permit the Serbs to continue their atrocities and defiance unchallenged, at the cost of so many lives, and to continue to acquire additional territory that we do not plan to let them keep, is equally senseless and tragic. Something, then, needs to be done immediately. Certainly, the Bosnian Government has the inherent right of self-defence against armed attack, and no one can claim the Council has taken measures "necessary to maintain international peace and security" in that region. At a minimum, therefore, we feel there must be a lifting of the arms embargo as it applies to the Bosnian Government. We must also move to

(Mr. Olhaye, Djibouti)

take out Serbian heavy weapons if the Serbs do not themselves remove them, and we must be prepared to protect the delivery of humanitarian aid. Now we are talking of a new concept which we of the Non-Aligned group proposed a few months ago and which was the basis of resolutions 819 (1993) and 824 (1993).

Are the "safe areas", then, the answer? That may be the case to contain the hellish situation in the immediate future. The entire world, however, has cast doubts on the whole concept, as lacking a connection to an overall political solution, not to mention the genuine fear that the concept could legitimize "ethnic cleansing" and the status quo - created by the Serbs - largely through the unwillingness of the international community even to rattle its swords. Again, there is a legitimate fear that the "safe areas" strategy may translate as the only viable alternative to an acceptable peace plan, and that the concept is merely a euphemism for "ghettos" or "concentration camps" for refugees who have little to aspire to by way of normal life - politically, socially, or economically - in the foreseeable future.

Like all previous resolutions, the present draft resolution affirms Bosnia and Herzegovina as no less a member of the United Nations than any one of us. Yet the pervasive fear persists that the current policy of "safe areas" may condemn this unfortunate people to a precarious Palestinian-style existence. And this scepticism essentially underlined the painful and tedious negotiations the Non-Aligned Movement Caucus had been undertaking with the sponsors of this draft resolution, as well as with the remaining members of the Council.

(Mr. Olhaye, Djibouti)

In many ways the "safe areas" draft resolution may be considered a watershed in the history of the Bosnian conflict. Its sponsors have seen fit to accept a number of strong measures, which, if sincere and followed through, can provide some basis for a near-term halt to the killings, and for a long-term solution to the crisis. There is the bold reaffirmation of Bosnia's sovereignty and territorial integrity, that "ethnic cleansing" and its consequences, including the acquisition of territory by force, must be reversed, and support for the Vance-Owen Plan as the continuing goal for resolving this conflict. There are many forthright words in the draft resolution, indeed.

(Mr. Olhaye, Djibouti)

We must, however, expect the Serbs to test us, to defy us, to obstruct us. Their feeling is that they have won, and that the West must be praised for its "more realistic approach". Safe areas must therefore be protected, rehabilitated, and supplied with basic humanitarian necessities and services. We must be prepared to let the Serbs know firmly that the United Nations can be pushed no further, and that measures indicated in the draft resolution will be carried out. There should be United Nations monitors on the borders of Yugoslavia despite the objections. Serbian heavy artillery must be removed from the vicinity of safe areas.

We are a CNN world. If the results of this draft resolution are simply more of the same - killing, starvation, Serbian brutality - then the world may have to accept the fact that international collective security does not exist.

Mindful of those many reservations and with a feeling of déjà vu, my delegation, after considerable thought, is supporting the draft resolution, and accepts in good faith the strong affirmation of the sponsoring members that this time they do indeed mean business.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I shall now put to the vote the draft resolution contained in document S/25870.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Brazil, Cape Verde, China, Djibouti, France, Hungary, Japan, Morocco, New Zealand, Russian Federation, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Against: none

Abstaining: Pakistan, Venezuela

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): The result of the voting is as follows: 13 votes in favour, none against, and 2 abstentions. The draft resolution has thus been adopted as resolution 836 (1993).

I shall now call on those members who wish to make statements following the voting.

Mr. SARDENBERG (Brazil): The delegation of Brazil voted in favour of resolution 836 (1993). We see it as yet another step in a process that still has several rounds to go, a process whose ultimate objective remains the attainment of a just and lasting settlement to the cruel conflict that rages in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The Brazilian Government has been following with continued apprehension the deterioration of the humanitarian situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina, where persistent violations of international humanitarian law and intolerable obstructions of humanitarian efforts seem to be the unacceptable rule. My delegation could not fail to support action by the Security Council aimed at alleviating the plight of the Bosnian people.

In our view, the decision taken by the Council today is to be understood as a temporary measure and should have a twofold objective: immediately or in the very short run, to preserve the safety of and ensure minimum living conditions for the populations in the safe areas; and at a later stage to be reached as quickly as possible, to restore full normalcy to life in those areas. The fulfilment of those conditions is the yardstick against which the effectiveness of this resolution will be measured.

There should be no doubt in anyone's mind that this resolution can be considered neither the ideal nor the final response of the Security Council to

(Mr. Sardenberg, Brazil)

the conflict. In spite of its shortcomings, though, it constitutes a concrete step and embodies a significant qualitative change in the way the Council has been dealing with this matter so far.

More than once in the course of the negotiations that led to the adoption of this resolution, concerns were expressed to the effect that the present safe-areas concept could lead to a freezing of the current situation on the ground, rewarding military might to the detriment of the Muslim community. In addition to the assurances that have been given to the contrary, and in order to respond to that legitimate concern, we consider it essential that in due course the resolution just adopted be complemented by appropriate additional measures.

My delegation continues to believe that the ultimate solution to the murderous conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina must come through negotiation and peaceful means, and that, in this connection, the Peace Plan put together by Mr. Cyrus Vance and Lord Owen retains its full value.

While that objective should be kept as the main goal of the endeavours of the international community, and in particular of the Security Council, it is our sincere hope that the resolution adopted today, circumscribed as it may be, will prove to be both reallsllc and effective and will have a direct bearing on easing the unspeakable suffering that for so long has been imposed upon innocent people in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Mr. VORONTSOV (Russian Federation) (interpretation from Russian): The Russian delegation was among the sponsors of the draft resolution just adopted by the Security Council, which enacts measures to ensure full

(Mr. Vorontsov, Russian Federation)

observance of the safe-areas regime in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina. To that end the resolution sets out a serious package of very effective and genuinely practicable measures. Thus, the Security Council has taken a concrete step towards the implementation of the joint programme of action adopted at Washington on 22 May by the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of France, the Russian Federation, Spain, the United Kingdom and the United States. That programme is intended to give the settlement process in Bosnia and Herzegovina a chance to catch its breath, and to stabilize the situation in other critical areas of the former Yugoslavia.

In their proposals, which supplement earlier political approaches, the participants in the Washington meeting set themselves a goal taking into account the dynamics of the situation: the pragmatic search for ways to quench the Bosnian fire and achieve a lasting political settlement on the basis of the unconditional preservation of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina as a single State.

The cornerstone of the Washington programme is the advisability of step-by-step, consistent implementation of the Vance-Owen Plan. The programme is a balanced package of actions in various areas, and is addressed to all parties to the conflict. It confirms readiness to continue humanitarian assistance to Bosnia and Herzegovina; it approves the concept of safe areas; and it clearly sets out the issues with respect to sealing the boundaries of that country, including through the use of international observers. The participants in the Washington meeting reaffirmed the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force by the parties to the conflict.

(Mr. Vorontsov, Russian Federation)

All of this constitutes real steps necessary to promote stability in the former Yugoslavia. But the Washington programme does not exclude the adoption of new, firmer measures: nothing has been ruled in or ruled out.

(Mr. Vorontsov, Russian Federation)

The core of the five-party declaration is the effort to maintain the process of the Yugoslavian - and primarily the Bosnian - settlement within political boundaries. It is also an effort not to allow the international community to be drawn into a military solution to the problem, because that leads to a dead-end, to new victims and to destruction.

The tragic events in recent days in a number of places in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina which were declared safe areas by Security Council resolution 824 (1993), and the endless suffering of the Bosnians, who have been deprived of the most elementary means of existence, make it necessary immediately to expand the mandate of the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR) in order to ensure, in practice, the safe areas regime, and in particular to deter aggression, to monitor the cease-fire, and to allow for the unhindered delivery of humanitarian assistance.

The Russian delegation is firmly convinced that the implementation of this resolution will be an important practical step by the world community genuinely to curb the violence and to stop the shooting on the long-suffering land of the Bosnians. Henceforth, any attempted military attacks, shooting and shelling of safe areas, any armed incursions into those areas, and any hindrance to the delivery of humanitarian assistance will be stopped by United Nations forces by using all necessary measures, including the use of armed force. This will be an important factor for stabilizing the situation in these areas and for lessening the suffering of the civilian population.

We hope that all parties to the conflict will show a readiness to cooperate on the basis of the resolution just adopted, which is to become an important stage in creating the preconditions for the consistent implementation of the Peace Plan. Only a cease-fire, and only the curbing of

(Mr. Vorontsov, Russian Federation)

violence - and this is the main purpose of the resolution adopted today - can lead to a genuine movement towards a peaceful settlement of the Bosnian crisis.

For its part, the Russian Federation will continue its most active efforts, collectively and bilaterally, to promote a speedy, peaceful solution to the Yugoslav crisis.

Mrs. ALBRIGHT (United States of America): Let me begin, Sir, by congratulating you on your assumption of the presidency of the Council. We look forward to a wonderful month with you. We are also very grateful for the tremendous work of the representative of the Russian Federation, Ambassador Vorontsov.

My Government is pleased that the Security Council has adopted this resolution creating safe areas in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina. We co-sponsored this resolution because we saw it as a means to save lives in that tormented Republic and facilitate the humanitarian needs of the Bosnian people.

We are committed to working with the international community to end this terrible war and to achieve a lasting and equitable settlement. The current resolution is not the end of the process. The sponsors of this resolution never intended it to be.

Let me speak plainly. The United States voted for this resolution with no illusions. It is an intermediate step - no more, no less.

Indeed, both the Security Council and the Governments that developed the Joint Action Programme have agreed that they will keep open options for new and tougher measures, none of which is prejudged or excluded from consideration. My Government's view of what those tougher measures should be has not changed.

(Mrs. Albright, United States)

Finally, let me say that we expect the full cooperation of the Bosnian Serb party in implementing this resolution. If that cooperation is not forthcoming, we will move to seek further action in the Security Council. The violence must stop. This resolution can be a decisive step in that direction.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I thank the representative of the United States for her kind words addressed to me.

Mr. LI Zhaoxing (China) (interpretation from Chinese): The Chinese delegation has all along been greatly concerned about the crisis in the region of the former Yugoslavia in general and about the tragic unfolding of the conflicts in Bosnia and Herzegovina in particular. Of late, armed conflicts in Bosnia and Herzegovina have continued unabated and the humanitarian situation has drastically deteriorated, plunging the people into the most miserable plight, with immense loss of life and property, for which the Chinese delegation cannot but feel greatly concerned and disturbed.

The continued escalation and deepening of the conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina constitute a great threat to peace and security in the region. Under the present circumstances, the establishment of a number of safe areas in Bosnia and Herzegovina may as well be tried as a temporary measure in order to reduce conflicts and ease the people's afflictions, even though it cannot provide a fundamental solution to the conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina. In addition, it may involve a multitude of complex factors and a series of difficulties in the course of implementation. We believe that this temporary measure cannot supplant the Peace Plan for a comprehensive political solution to the conflict. On the contrary, we hope that this temporary measure will be conducive to finding a political solution to the conflict. It was proceeding

(Mr. Li Zhaoxing, China)

from the aforementioned humanitarian consideration that the Chinese delegation voted in favour of the resolution just adopted.

China has always actively advocated the peaceful solution to disputes in international relations through dialogue and negotiation and opposed the threat or use of force. We have therefore consistently supported the unrelenting efforts of the Co-Chairmen of the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia to seek a political solution to the conflict within the framework of the Conference. Guided by this principled position, we would like to point out that the invoking in this resolution of Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter to authorize the use of force, as well as the implication in the resolution that further military action would be taken in Bosnia and Herzegovina may, instead of helping the effort to seek an enduring peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina, further complicate the issue there, and adversely affect the peace process. For this, we cannot but express our reservations.

We in China have an old saying, "There are no winners in a war and peace benefits all." We very much hope that all the parties to the conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina will, setting store by the interests of the people, cease forthwith all hostilities, guarantee the smooth delivery of humanitarian relief aid, solve their disputes expeditiously through peaceful negotiations, and achieve genuine national reconciliation in Bosnia and Herzegovina, so that its people may soon embark on the road to the reconstruction of their homeland in a peaceful environment.

Mr. HATANO (Japan): Japan is deeply concerned by the continuing hostilities in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Japan continues to believe that the conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina should be settled through negotiations, and the Peace Plan worked out by Mr. Vance and Lord Owen still remains the only viable means of achieving lasting peace in this area.

Japan again demands that the Bosnian Serbs immediately cease all hostilities and return to the negotiating table without delay. The continuing occupation by the Bosnian Serbs of the territories they control through the use of force and by means of "ethnic cleansing" can never be tolerated.

(Mr. Hatano, Japan)

In view of the special and extraordinary circumstances prevailing in the territory, Japan supports the proposal contained in the resolution to expand the mandate of the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR) in the hope that this will prevent further bloodshed and preserve the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Japan stresses, however, that this proposal should be regarded as a means for achieving our long-term and comprehensive objective of a just and lasting settlement of the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina. In this connection, I look forward to receiving and studying the report by the Secretary-General on the implementation of this resolution.

Mr. ERDOS (Hungary) (interpretation from French): In the context of resolution 836 (1993), which the Council has just adopted, the question, for Hungary, is not of the need for safe areas, but rather of seeking adequate responses to some of the related problems that have arisen in that connection.

To what extent does the creation of such areas fit into the implementation of the Vance-Owen Plan? How can one be assured of the temporary nature of this measure so that at some point displaced persons can return home? Is the Security Council capable of guaranteeing effective protection of safe areas? How can one be sure that the establishment of safe areas is in no way an action that might undermine the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina or give recognition or legitimacy to the results of "ethnic cleansing"?

Resolution 836 (1993) seeks to answer these very legitimate questions. It seems to us that, unfortunately, the responses are not entirely satisfactory and that the solutions set out in that resolution are far from

(Mr. Erdös, Hungary)

ideal. We note, at the same time, the important positive changes made to the text in the course of the Council's prior deliberations, in response to concerns expressed by many of us, which made the resolution adopted today better suited to meeting the present challenges in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

This resolution treats only the symptoms, because it does not give a fully convincing response to the key issue, at present, in the Bosnian conflict: reversing the results of the aggression which has been carried out with impunity in that country.

Hungary voted in favour of resolution 836 (1993) because it reaffirms once again the illegality and inadmissibility of any acquisition of territory by force. It reaffirms that the concept of safe areas, is in no way an end in itself, but rather represents a temporary measure, which is part and parcel of the Vance-Owen process. The resolution emphasizes, among the principles for a lasting solution to the conflict, withdrawal from territories acquired by force and the invalidation of the results of "ethnic cleansing". It approves the Peace Plan for the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina; reaffirms the need to restore fully the territorial integrity of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina; and decides to ensure full respect for the safe areas mentioned in Security Council resolution 824 (1993), which, let us recall, declares safe areas, in addition to the areas explicitly mentioned, other threatened areas as well.

We voted in favour of resolution 836 (1993) because we understand it as authorizing the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR) to resort to force in response to bombardments of safe areas or armed incursions or if there are deliberate impediments in or around those areas to the freedom of movement of

(Mr. Erdös, Hungary)

UNPROFOR or protected humanitarian convoys. We also understand the resolution as authorizing Member States to take all necessary measures, including air power, to support UNPROFOR in its activities.

We further note that resolution 836 (1993) calls for a report, at the latest two months after the adoption of this resolution, on its implementation and that it keeps open the possibility of new, sterner measures.

It would, none the less, be erroneous to think that the Security Council has done everything at this critical time not only to contain but to rebuff the aggression inspired and set in motion by greater-Serbia nationalism. That is why Hungary continues to emphasize that the resolution we have adopted today can only be the beginning of a process leading to a just and lasting solution facilitating the implementation of the Vance-Owen Plan, which, under present circumstances, remains the only available means to preserve the territorial integrity of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, end hostilities and restore normal living conditions for all ethnic and religious communities throughout the national territorty.

The Balkan crisis at the end of this century has uniquely shaken all the pillars upon which the edifice of European security and cooperation rests. The action in which the international community is now engaged falls under the heading of "too little, too late". It would be a fatal error to think that the Bosnian bloodbath involves only Bosnians, because the settlement of this conflict is of strategic interest to the entire international community, and what is at stake in the valleys and mountains of that majestic country goes far beyond the confines of that Republic. Not to understand that or just to procrastinate would amount to condemning ourselves to repeat history and would show that we are surprisingly incapable of learning the lessons of the

(Mr. Erdös, Hungary)

hateful, ominous events that have taken place in the twentieth century in that part of Europe.

If we accept the triumph of violence and intolerance, their success will be taken as encouragement by all those who feel that they can pursue similar objectives and who are so inclined, because they will be assured that the world will stand helplessly by and watch them carry out their sinister plans.

One of the risks inherent in resolution 836 (1993) is the possibility of establishing a state structure of isolated enclaves maintained only through international assistance, the freezing of a situation and the de facto recognition of realities on the ground resulting from blood and fire.

One would be harbouring illusions if one were to believe that such a situation would be the sort of thing to restore peace and stability in this region. Quite the contrary: as European history has so often shown us, injustice and persecution sow the seeds of future conflicts. After the second world conflagration the peoples of the world decided to erect international structures in order to be able not only to deter but also to rebuff aggressors. The inviolability of this principle is one of the raisons d'être of the United Nations.

Despite the world's tragic, inexcusable delays in dealing with this grave problem that affects the entire network of international relations, and for which we continue to pay a heavy price in tears and blood, it is still not too late for us finally, with the necessary determination, to use the arsenal of the means available to us through our Organization's Charter.

(Mr. Erdös, Hungary)

It is in view of the immense moral and political responsibility of the Security Council to act in keeping with the provisions of the United Nations Charter and to avoid passivity, which would be tantamount to complicity with arrogance and aggression, that Hungary has decided, filled with torment and anguish because of its convictions of principle and because of its geopolitical situation, to vote in favour of this resolution.

Sir David HANNAY (United Kingdom): On 22 May in Washington, the United Kingdom, together with France, the Russian Federation, Spain and the United States, agreed a Joint Action Programme for Bosnia. The five countries felt it important to reach a common view amongst themselves on the way ahead as a basis for effective action. We achieved that common view in Washington and identified areas for immediate action in the Security Council. We also reaffirmed the urgent requirement for a negotiated settlement, committing ourselves to intensified efforts to achieve that.

Now we are making some progress with this immediate agenda. On 25 May the Security Council adopted resolution 827 (1993) to establish an International War Crimes Tribunal. This shows the international community's resolve that the atrocities committed during this terrible conflict will be investigated and the perpetrators held individually responsible. We are also considering a resolution on the international monitoring of the Serbia-Montenegro border with Bosnia. We want to pursue this, a l we do not believe that this Council should be deflected by the negative attitude of Mr. Milosevic.

The resolution on "safe areas", which we have just adopted, is another essential step in the immediate agenda. The aim is to provide further help to large concentrations of the civilian population, most of whom are Muslims. A

(Sir David Hannay,
United Kingdom)

new element is that we, with France and the United States, probably acting in a NATO framework, are prepared, once authorized by this resolution, to make available air power in response to calls for assistance from United Nations forces in and around the "safe areas". To implement this concept of "safe areas" effectively, the United Nations will need some further troops, and we will support the Secretary-General in his efforts to attract new contributions, including from some Islamic States.

The "safe areas" will not stop the war. They are a temporary measure. But they could provide further areas of stability and complement the important efforts undertaken day by day by United Nations forces throughout Bosnia to help with the humanitarian effort on which so many lives depend. In the case of British forces, this means constant activity along the supply route from Split to the Tuzla "safe area" through Central Bosnia, where tension between Bosnian Croats and Muslims is high.

There are some suggestions that a policy of "safe areas" might be combined with a lifting of the arms embargo. My Government does not see this combination as an option, nor, we believe, do other Governments with troops on the ground. The two policies are distinct and alternative. It would be hard to reconcile the supply of arms with United Nations peace-keeping on the ground.

I want to stress that these immediate steps are designed to reinforce our effort towards the overriding objective, which remains a lasting and equitable peace. This can be achieved only by agreement between the three parties in Bosnia. There evidently remain deep divisions between them. But the continuation of the political process is essential. However difficult it is

(Sir David Hannay,
United Kingdom)

and however long it takes, Lord Owen and Mr. Stoltenberg must remain in the lead on this.

The principles which must be observed in a peace settlement are spelt out in the Vance-Owen peace plan, and they remain valid. There can be no acceptance of the acquisition of territory or alteration of borders by force. This means that until the Serbs withdraw from the land they have seized, there can be no final settlement. Sanctions, which are causing serious damage to Serbia's economy, will remain in place until the Serbs comply.

The Joint Action Programme in the Washington Agreement is based on the principles of the London Conference, and it is designed to maintain momentum towards a political settlement. Negotiations to complete the political process will continue: Lord Owen and Mr. Stoltenberg are now visiting the former Yugoslavia for this purpose. Nor, as this resolution makes clear, do the Washington Agreement or the views of my Government rule out other, stronger measures as the situation develops.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I will now make a statement in my capacity as representative of Spain.

Spain shares with the rest of the international community the anguish and frustration that result from the continuation of the cruel war afflicting the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The recent worsening of the fighting has added to our concern and has helped convince us of the need to act urgently and firmly in order not to allow the principle of "might makes right" to rule that country.

Aware of its responsibility as a European country and as a member of the Security Council, Spain will continue to contribute, through its participation

(The President)

in the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR), to the efforts to alleviate the atrocious suffering of the civilian population of Bosnia and Herzegovina, as well to try to bring about an end to this conflict on the basis of a just and lasting settlement.

For this reason, and as a co-sponsor, Spain is gratified by the adoption of resolution 836 (1993) concerning the protection of "safe areas" in Bosnia and Herzegovina. This transforms into a resolution another of the measures considered of priority nature by the member countries of the European Community and also reflected in the Joint Action Programme announced in Washington on 22 May by the Foreign Ministers of the United States, the Russian Federation, France, the United Kingdom and Spain.

With the expansion of the UNPROFOR mandate to ensure full respect of the "safe areas", we have today taken an important step aimed at saving lives, protecting threatened territories, permitting free access to humanitarian assistance and also facilitating the future application of the Vance-Owen peace plan.

By deciding to strengthen the protection of the "safe areas" to which resolutions 819 (1993) and 824 (1993) referred, the Council has acted consistently. Resolution 836 (1993) is a logical consequence of two prior resolutions adopted unanimously - the ones to which I referred a moment ago. This is therefore a measure that is of a limited and temporary nature, it is true; but its importance must not for this reason be underestimated.

The measure involves a considerable increase in the tasks entrusted to UNPROFOR, and, in fact, it presupposes an important qualitative change, with the explicit authorization of the use of force by UNPROFOR under given circumstances, as well as the use of air power to support UNPROFOR in the

(The President)

fulfilment of its expanded mandate. All of this means a considerable additional burden for UNPROFOR and a further increase in the responsibility that this United Nations peace-keeping force bears.

I am emphasizing the expanded aspects of this mandate because the humanitarian-assistance convoys will require escorts, and, therefore, UNPROFOR, in Bosnia and Herzegovina, will continue to discharge its responsibilities in this field. For the new tasks that derive from the resolution we have just adopted, considerable reinforcements and possible redeployments will therefore be required. For this reason, we hope that the response of those Member States from which the Secretary-General may request additional contingents will be generous.

UNPROFOR's reinforced protection of the six areas mentioned in this resolution is aimed at increasing their security and at providing higher levels of safety and well-being for the threatened civilian population. This is the immediate objective of the resolution we have just adopted.

But the attainment of safer areas does not in any way constitute an end in itself. It should be understood as a partial, provisional, temporary measure adopted as a first step towards the full implementation of the Vance-Owen peace plan, which remains our primary objective, as the resolution itself affirms.

(The President)

With this resolution and the resolution establishing the International War Crimes Tribunal that was adopted last week, and with what we hope will be the forthcoming adoption of a resolution on the deployment of international observers on the borders of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the international community will have given added proof of resolve and coherence in its defence of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of that Republic and of the peace that we all wish to achieve.

We hope that it will not be necessary to resort to other options or to adopt more energetic measures, but we must be prepared to act promptly, if circumstances so require, in accordance with the commitment undertaken in this resolution.

I now resume my functions as President of the Security Council.

There are no further speakers inscribed on my list.

The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on the agenda.

The Security Council will remain seized of the matter.

The meeting rose at 1.40 p.m.